

JUNE 10, 1952  
720th BROADCAST

# Town Meeting



Illinois U Library  
BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR



Broadcast by 300 Stations of the ABC Radio Network

U. S. Pat. Off.

Reg. U. S. Pat. Off.

## Should Our Foreign Policy Be Changed?

Moderator, ORVILLE HITCHCOCK

*S p e a k e r s*

ROBERT AURA SMITH

GEORGE W. MALONE



—COMING—

—June 24, 1952—

**Do the Conventions Represent the Will  
of the People?**

Published by THE TOWN HALL, Inc., New York 36, N. Y.

VOLUME 18, NUMBER 6



\$5.00 A YEAR, 15c A COPY



# Town Meeting

Vol. 18

No. 6



## Should Our Foreign Policy Be Changed?

The Broadcast of June 10, 1952, from 9:00 to 9:45 p. m., EDT, over the American Broadcasting Company Radio Network, originated in Congregation Emanu-El-B'ne Jeshuran, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, under the auspices of the Wisconsin State College.

The account of the meeting reported in this Bulletin was transcribed from recordings made of the actual broadcast and represents the exact content of the meeting as nearly as such mechanism permits. The publishers and printer are not responsible for the statements of the speakers or the points of views presented.

### THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN

**SENATOR GEORGE W. MALONE**—Republican of Nevada; member of Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and Public Works Committee. A former State Engineer of Nevada (1927-35), Senator Malone has been special consultant on strategic and critical minerals and materials to the Senate Military Affairs Subcommittee and to the Chandler Committee on Examination of Military Establishments. He has also served as expert consultant to the Secretary of War and advisor to the Secretary of the Interior in the construction of the Hoover Dam. His report on the natural resources of the area and the use of power was published in 1935. Elected to the Senate in November, 1946, Senator Malone is former chairman of the U.S. Senate National Resources Economic Committee and is chairman of the Flood Control, Navigation, Dams and Electric Power Subcommittee of the Senate Public Works Committee.

**ROBERT AURA SMITH**—Editorial writer, *The New York Times*; expert on the Far East. Born in Denver in 1899, Robert Aura Smith was graduated from Ohio Wesleyan University, and as a Rhodes scholar received his master's degree from Oxford University. He returned to the United States to teach, and in 1925 joined the editorial staff of the Cincinnati *Commercial Tribune*. He left for Manila in 1930 to become news editor of the *Manila Daily Bulletin* and a staff correspondent for the *New York Times*. During World War II, he worked with the OWI. He is now widely known as a lecturer on the Far East, where last winter he completed a survey of twelve countries. Mr. Smith is the author of several books on our foreign policy.

**Moderator—ORVILLE HITCHCOCK**—Professor of Speech at the State University of Iowa.

Town Meeting is published weekly at 32 S. Fourth St., Columbus 15, Ohio, by The Town Hall, Inc., New York 36, New York. Send subscriptions and single copy orders to Town Hall, New York 36, N.Y.

Subscription price, \$5.00 a year, (Canada, \$6.00); six months, \$3.00, (Canada, \$3.50); eight weeks, \$1.00, (Canada, \$1.20); 15c a single copy. Entered as second-class matter eight weeks, \$1.00, (Canada, \$1.20); 15c a single copy. Entered as second-class matter

Copyright, 1952, BY THE TOWN HALL, INC.

# Should Our Foreign Policy Be Changed?

## Announcer:

Tonight Town Meeting is the guest of Wisconsin State College, with the broadcast originating from the auditorium of Temple Emanu-El-B'ne Jeshuran, in Milwaukee.

In presenting this program to its students and townspeople, Wisconsin State College is reaffirming its insistence that education for both citizens and students go beyond the walls of the classroom and participate directly in the presentation of issues and personalities which are shaping the modern world. Civic-minded Milwaukee corporations have helped to make this program possible.

As the major part of its academic program, the college has, since 1885, trained teachers who have held important positions, not only in the state, but even beyond the boundaries of our nation. Since 1951, the college has added a forward-looking liberal arts program to its curriculum, bringing for the first time to local youth the opportunity to earn a liberal arts degree at a Milwaukee public institution of higher learning.

Now, to preside as moderator for tonight's discussion, here is Dr. Orville Hitchcock, Professor of Speech at the State University of Iowa.

## Moderator Hitchcock:

Good Evening, friends. Tonight we are speaking to you from the beautiful auditorium of Temple Emanu-El, in Milwaukee, where we are the guests of Wisconsin State College. We are most happy to have this opportunity of participating in the program of Public

Institutes, Lectures and Concerts sponsored by Wisconsin State College for its students and the citizens of Milwaukee.

In a little less than a month from now, the 1952 political conventions will get underway in Chicago. As the Republican and Democratic leaders debate the planks of their respective party platforms, you and I are going to hear much and read much about the foreign policy of the United States. The conventions and the campaign this year happen to come at a critical period in world affairs.

This evening, Town Meeting continues its series of broadcasts on this basic and important issue for the discussion of the question, "Should Our Foreign Policy Be Changed?" To help us answer the question, we have two especially well-qualified speakers: Senator George W. Malone, Republican of Nevada, member of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and the Public Works Committee, believes that our foreign policy should be changed. Mr. Robert Aura Smith, editorial writer for the *New York Times* and specialist on the Far East, thinks that our foreign policy cannot be changed.

Maybe we should take first things first, Mr. Smith, and ask you to start our discussion by telling us what, in your opinion, our present foreign policy is.

## Mr. Smith:

Dr. Hitchcock, that's not an easy question, is it, since our policy is the end-product of 175 years of living as a nation? I think we're concerned, however, with the pre-



sent implications of our policy, and there we're on relatively firm ground.

First of all, we are opposed to Soviet imperialist expansion. We are opposed to communism in principle and in practice, and a great deal of our policy is geared to that opposition.

To effectuate that opposition, we're trying to create what we call positions of strength, and gaining those positions of strength at various points in the world through military and economic assistance.

In addition to that, within the framework of the United Nations, we are undertaking to bring together, in a network of defense, states that feel as we do and that are in danger—such as the North Atlantic Organization, our Pan-American Organization, and now our Asiatic Security Pact.

In addition to that, we have special areas in policy, such as the area in the Far East. There, I believe, we are determined to try, if we can, to reach an armistice, an honorable armistice, in Korea, but not to extend the scope of those hostilities if it is within our power not to do so. We may be compelled to do so, but it is not our initiative.

Similarly, in the Far East we've proposed to continue to recognize the honorable Nationalist government of China, now in Formosa, and to continue to oppose recognition of the communist regime in Peking and its admission to the United Nations. Those, I take it, are parts of this policy. I do not believe that those policies, into many of which we have been forced by the hard logic of circumstance, cannot possibly be changed.

**Mr. Hitchcock:**

Senator Malone, maybe you don't quite agree with that definition of our present foreign policy. Well, what would you add to that?

**Senator Malone:**

Well, I think he covered the groundwork. Naturally we all agree that we are against communist expansion. How to prevent it is something else.

He says we are still for Chiang Kai-shek. We have a fine way of showing that we are for Chiang Kai-shek. We ruined him, run him out of China, and now we have him bottled up with our fleet. If we're for him, turn him loose on that mainland and let him go.

Now some believe that we should have this economic one world, that we should divide our wealth, have a modification of the Constitution, and some go far enough to say that we ought to have a Federation of Nations, each with one vote—or each with two votes, two senators and Congressmen, in accordance with the population.

However, many of us believe that we should maintain our own economic integrity while we are helping the world to get along, and be on a long-range basis so we can hold up our economy. Everyone knows now we are simply on an emergency economy. If we run out of the emergency now, this country would go down economically in just practically no time at all.

So I say to you that our foreign policy has succeeded in seven short years since World War II in dissipating the greatest army and the greatest navy and the greatest air force in the world, so that now

we have nothing to back up any policy—and everyone knows that a foreign policy is just as strong as the nation behind it.

We know that we have lost the greater part of Europe. It's behind the Iron Curtain in the hands of another dictator. We've whipped one dictator and put it in the hands of another—perhaps worse than the one we licked.

The Allies we have left in Europe are weak. They are on our payroll, and when we quit doling out the money, they sink without a trace.

Now we know the Middle East is in a ferment. We know that we're losing the Moslem world of 350,000,000 people and we know that we have lost China with our policy in the Far East and are in a fair way of losing Asia.

I merely say here that at home we're trying now to bring back together a great Air Force. I hope we are. They say we've lost control of the air, and I simply say that if we have, every man connected with it in the National Defense Department ought to be impeached, because it's a great job to lose control of the air in a country that has the construction capacity that this country has.

We are bleeding our taxpayers white. They can't stand it very much longer. We're on the ragged edge of an economic disaster, with this progressive taxation taking every dime that anyone can make so that they can't even have reserves in a business. A young fellow getting out of college, such as your own here, if anyone is crazy enough to loan him money to go into a business after he pays his income tax out of his earn-

ings, he can't keep enough money to pay the money back, so he's going to be a perpetual employee.

**Mr. Hitchcock:** Senator, I wonder if I could interrupt a moment before we get out more points to discuss several that you've already brought forward. Mr. Smith, maybe you'd like to step in here and say a word about the situation in China and in Formosa. That was one of the early points that Senator Malone brought up.

**Mr. Smith:** I'm in entire agreement, Dr. Hitchcock, with Senator Malone's criticism of our policy since 1945 in the Far East, but what I urge is that through a series of blunders, flip-flops, and mistakes, we have finally got on the right track. We now do have a military mission in Formosa. We are at the present time supporting Chiang Kai-shek. We have reversed the disastrous policies of 1946, '47, '48 and '49.

We did lose China. We're not going to lose the bastion of Free China—Formosa. I think that's a very definite change in policy for the better, and I don't think now that having got onto the right track we should get on to the wrong one.

**Mr. Hitchcock:** Senator, is that right? Are we on the right track now in Formosa?

**Senator Malone:** Well, we may be on the right track, but we're mired down. In other words, we may be helping to support Chiang Kai-shek. I hope he's eating regularly but we still have the Navy bottling him up. If you're going to whip these communists over in China, don't murder those kids out there. We've lost the air

control. We won't let them win. We have a place over there beyond the Yula River like Ducks, Incorporated, where, when they get tired, they can go over there and sit down and quack at us.

So we are not fighting them, and we're putting those boys up against a cold deck every day.

Let's make up our mind what we are going to do. A fight is something you are supposed to win or keep out of. I say that we will lose the rest of Asia just like we've lost China. They'll move into Burma, and they'll move into Siam. That's the feed-box of Asia. They'll take that and come right down and run the English out of Singapore yet. So you're on the way to losing the whole thing with the thing you're doing at this moment.

**Mr. Hitchcock:** Thank you, Senator. Now, Mr. Smith's been restless back there, I notice, and wants to say something.

**Mr. Smith:** Well, what's the alternative? The alternative to that then is to undertake a full-dress war on the mainland of Asia, and that's the thing that we want to avoid if we possibly can. We're trying to get an armistice. We're trying to get a cessation of hostilities, not an enlargement of them. We're trying, in effect, to keep the peace as far as we can. If a breach of the peace is forced on us, we'll fight as hard as we possibly can.

Actually, the Senator and I are not talking about the same thing. Dr. Hitchcock, the Senator's not talking about policy. The Senator's talking about the implementation of policy, and that's quite a different thing.

**Mr. Hitchcock:** You think you both agree on policy, but he says it should be handled another way.

**Mr. Smith:** Why, sure. I think we're in very substantial agreement on what our policy is, and Senator Malone is not suggesting that our policy be substantially changed. What he's saying is that to carry out these policies, we need a more effective armed force, we need a better Air Force than we've got now. I agree one hundred per cent, Senator, and I certainly hope that the great institution of which you are a member will see to it that the funds for that bigger Air Force are provided. (*Applause*)

**Senator Malone:** I just hope that this audience recalls that in 1948 George Malone of Nevada, along with about four other Senators, on the Senate floor took the President's program away from him. He wanted fifty-six air groups. We gave him seventy, and he built forty-eight and spent the money someplace else. Now that's the way we lost control of the air, and he did it deliberately. That isn't a mistake. No one could be dumb enough to make a mistake like that. So I say, get those kids out of there or let them go; and if you haven't control of the air, you have to protect them. You're murdering them now, doing it deliberately. (*Applause*)

**Mr. Hitchcock:** Senator, that applause was led by your colleague here, Mr. Smith. Maybe he wants to agree with you now.

**Mr. Smith:** Oh, I agree very definitely on the need for a strong Air Force. I think we've got to have it. I think we have to have



a strong Naval Force and I think we've got to have better trained land forces than we have at the present time. The implementation of policy is not going to be easy, and it's not going to be cheap. We can't do this job cheap at home or abroad.

We have a big world-wide commitment against a world-wide enemy, and there's no such thing as crawling back in a corner and hoping that everything will work out for the best if we're just sweetly reasonable and nice and economical about everything.

**Senator Malone:** Mr. Chairman, what we have now is putting hundreds of thousands of foot soldiers in Europe. They're a tourist army; they're over there to spend money and lure the Marshall Plan. They can't protect themselves now or at any future time. We've lost control of the air. They remind me of a tribe of Indians out in the Nevada mountains hunting pianets with their kids and the women with them.

Did anybody ever hear of such a thing? If a battle started, they're either prisoners of war or are cut to pieces in thirty days—whatever the enemy wanted to do. This is one of the most terrible things that has ever been done to this country—to make our people believe that we can win a war in Europe with a foot army.

I would simply say to you, Mr. Moderator, they have all the money they can use. They have twelve billion dollars laid away that they didn't use last year and they have it for next year. They're not spending it. They lost control of the air deliberately. I just want

to tell you that that is what Congress believes. They'll give them all the money they want. There is no question of money. There is a question of policy.

And they have this army in Korea. It's untenable if a fight starts. You have to get out of there. No general will ever tell you different, and no general will ever tell you that you can win that war with a foot army in France and Europe. I took a foot army, helped take one, in 1918. We're trying to fight World War I over again, and nobody's going to fight it that way.

Russia has control of the air, Vandenberg says, and Finletter says, regardless of what the President boasted about the other night.

**Mr. Hitchcock:** The Senator, ladies and gentlemen, is being very emphatic here and the noise you hear is him punctuating his points on the rostrum.

Mr. Smith, we have a number of questions opened up here. One has to do with this matter of air power and our land army in Europe. Is that connected with foreign policy? Should we talk about that a little?

**Mr. Smith:** I insist, Dr. Hitchcock, that is not a policy problem. That is an implementation problem.

**Mr. Hitchcock:** And you're willing to go along with the idea.

**Mr. Smith:** Why certainly, I'm not suggesting for one moment that the Administration under which we have been living for some time has done a particularly good job in implementing our policies. I'm perfectly willing and eager to see that Administration

changed in November. (*Applause*) But I do not believe that a change of administration can possibly mean a change in the mainstream of our major policies, because our major policies have been forced on us, against, sometimes, our own will. They have been forced on us by the compulsion of events. They've been forced on us by an implacable foe. Those policies stem in the long run from our reaction as free people to a slave regime. We can't change that. We don't want to change it.

**Senator Malone:** Well, Mr. Moderator, I'm going to have to get into this policy, I guess. If we have a policy, we have one of a one-economic world policy, of division of the wealth, of throwing money all over the landscape. We first called it lend-lease and we went beyond any manner or means of supporting an ally. Then we had UNRRA. Then we had the three and three-quarter's billion to England, then we had the Marshall Plan, then we had the ECA, then the Point Four. Now we have the Mutual Security. Doesn't matter what you call it: we're putting the money out beyond the ability of our taxpayers to pay and hold up indefinitely. They cannot possibly do it. (*Applause*)

So I say, instead of this free trade policy, putting the working men and investors of America in direct competition with the slave labor and sweat shop labor of Europe and Asia, let's have a policy, a foreign trade based on a fair and reasonable competition with that old tariff of making up the difference so you people can work for reasonable wages.

Let's quit printing this counter-

feit money they laughingly call deficit financing, and everytime they print fifteen billion dollars more of it, they have to go out and get another raise in wages because it buys less bread.

Let's get rid of this taxation that takes every last dime you make, up to 91 or 92 per cent, so that no corporation or no business can save reserves. If they have one bad year, they're down. And if you run out of an emergency now, as an excuse for raising the taxes and selling more bonds, we're all down.

Let's get on a basis so we can wait. Russia is now on that basis. This policy is a ruinous policy. I'm not talking about augmenting a policy—I'm talking about turning around and starting in the other direction, protecting our economy. And every move we make from now on, if I had anything to do with it, would be put on a basis of our own security and safety and nobody else's. (*Applause*)

**Mr. Hitchcock:** Thank you, Senator. Now let's get Mr. Smith in on this matter of policy. Now what about the economic argument? Is our foreign policy carrying us beyond our economic means?

**Mr. Smith:** I do not think that our economic means have even been stretched yet. We haven't even got our coats off in this fight. I haven't heard of anybody who is in trouble, of having to work even a forty-eight hour week. I haven't seen any signs of great distress. I don't even think we've taken the thing seriously enough. (*Applause*) In any event, the idea that we can retreat from comit-



ments and say, "We will strengthen our economy and never mind where our commitments are," is extremely short-sighted; because after all, if we are in a world-wide fight, we want world-wide allies.

There is no sense in fighting a war by ourselves. There is no sense in letting two-thirds of the world be poured away when we can help it become strong, and in so doing, help ourselves. Much more than that, when it comes to cost, there is no cost comparable to the cost of defeat. (*Applause*) And by the cost of defeat, I mean not merely physical, not merely military defeat; I mean moral defeat because we're in a moral war. We are in a position from which we cannot morally and honorably make a retreat. We cannot say to the British, to the French, to the Italians, to the Belgians, to the Netherlands, to the South Koreans, to the Nationalist Chinese, to the Filipinos, to the Viet Nameese: "All right, we'll just write you off, because maybe we can't afford to help you." We're not that kind of people, praise heaven, we're made of better stuff. (*Applause*)

**Mr. Hitchcock:** Senator, would you like to comment a little more on this?

**Senator Malone:** I certainly would. No one said we're writing anybody off. We would protect any part of this world that's necessary to be protected for our own ultimate safety, and let me tell you something. It's time that we all studied it. We are the only protection Europe has, as well as our own protection, and when we go down economically, which we

are now headed for, no one has any protection.

So let me just say something about our allies. England and France each have separate economic and military pacts with Russia that read almost exactly like the Atlantic Pact with us, and they have fourteen years yet to run. Perhaps you didn't know that. They're signed up with both sides, just like the New York Giants and the Yankees, and whoever wins the pennant, they're in the money.

England recognized Communist China immediately, over our protest, and they're still trading with them and they have more than a hundred trade pacts—the sixteen Marshall Plan countries—with the Russian Iron Curtain countries and they're sending them every last blessed thing they need to fight World War III with us.

Now any help that we should give them or any guarantee of protection should be on a basis that they quit these trade pacts, that they not sign up with Communist China, that they cancel these trade and economic and military pacts with Russia, and do it forthwith. (*Applause*)

I want to say to you, before we start the questions, Italy in the last election turned up more Communist votes than they had in 1947. England has a government that's on the verge of Bevan taking over. He'll do it as soon as they have an election and he hates our guts. We don't have an ally, a dependable one, in Europe today. They're trading on the outside. What they're waiting for is to divide our wealth to the point that we go down with them, and when we're with them, we're down there just the same as the Chinamen

and the Indians and the rest of them with our standard of living just the same, and we can't protect ourselves or anybody else.

**Mr. Hitchcock:** Thank you, Senator. I think we should interrupt. I hate to interrupt this interesting

and high-spirited discussion, but I think we should start taking questions, because we have many people in our audience who have questions to ask and some of the things that you are about to say may be brought out here by questions.



#### GIFT SUBSCRIPTIONS

The *Town Meeting Bulletin* is a welcome gift for any occasion. Why not subscribe for your friends who are Town Meeting listeners? The Bulletin is \$5.00 a year. Address your order to Town Hall, New York 36, N.Y.

# QUESTIONS, PLEASE!

---

*Lady:* Senator Malone, why isn't our foreign policy based on a deep study of the Russian psychology, rather than an unrealistic aura of wishful hoping for a comfortable peace?

*Senator Malone:* Miss, I would like to say this to you: I do not think it has anything to do whatsoever with this administration. We're in an international undertow. I doubt if our present president had very much to do with it. But in this international undertow, we are spreading ourselves thin. We're dividing our wealth, not only dividing our markets through this free trade—laughingly called "reciprocal trade"—but we're dividing our money each year through the taxes. That's seven to ten billion dollars. Don't forget the banks that loan the money without return, in addition to the seven or eight billion they give them. So that the Russians themselves seem to be the least of our troubles. We're on a theory of world-wide government, with one world, with a federation of nations, as I've said before, each with one vote. Then they can vote the taxes on you without that slight embarrassment they have of coming to Congress at the present time.

*Man:* Mr. Smith, is it a fact that

U. S. funds given to the Chiang Kai-shek government ended up in private hands?

*Mr. Smith:* Some of them probably did. I think we had some mink coats and deep freezes in the Shanghai government, too. One of the difficulties in the giving of assistance to the Chiang Kai-shek government, when it was on the mainland of China, was the lack of adequate supervision of our aid. That lack has now been corrected. We have an excellent military mission in Formosa, a joint Agricultural Rehabilitation mission, and a first-class job is being done. Our money at the present time is not being wasted.

*Man:* Senator Malone, don't you think that the irresponsible attacks by our legislators on diplomats like Marshall and Acheson will keep intelligent and able young men from adopting diplomacy as a career?

*Senator Malone:* I think that if we had made the attacks in time to get rid of them before they lost China, we would have been in much better shape. I just happen to have been in Peking when the communists were three miles out, and I'll tell you what that great Chinese General, Fu Tso-yi, told me. He



sent a car in without lights to meet a plane without lights that I landed in. I went out for three hours with him at midnight, and a man about to die doesn't lie to you. He said when Marshall came over and stopped the American ammunition coming to American guns, he was licked. When they let the communists through the pass to get the ammunition in Southern Manchuria—those factories I have seen—he certainly was licked.

He had positive evidence that at least one of those factories was moved to the edge of Russia and Russia was running it and furnishing this ammunition.

Now he said—and he was a tough Chinaman—he sat without any decoration or anything, just like an ordinary man, and said: "I have kept the railroad open from the harbor to Peking. They can close it whenever they want to, and unless I get substantial help within the next thirty to sixty days, I am a prisoner of war." And he was. And Marshall carried out the orders of the Secretary of State just like an errand boy. Marshall was wrong. He is wrong. He never was right in anything he did in China or Asia. (*Applause*)

*Mr. Hitchcock:* Thank you, Senator. But first we would like to call on our host, Dr. J. Martin Klotzsche, president of Wisconsin State College. Some of our listeners may know Dr. Klotzsche as chairman of the Commission on Educational Organizations of the National Conference of Christians and Jews. He also was the founder and first president of Milwaukee's Town Hall. Dr. Klotzsche, I understand you have a question you would like to ask.

*Dr. Klotzsche:* Yes, Mr. Moderator, I wonder if I could ask Senator Malone a question. We're discussing here this evening the matter of whether or not our foreign policy should be changed, and I wonder if he would care to comment on the specific ways in which he would envisage our foreign policy changing in the event of a Republican victory in November. How would our foreign policy be any different in November if the Republicans were to go into office? (*Applause*)

*Senator Malone:* First, you understand, Mr. President, I'm not running for president. I do expect that the voters in Nevada treat me kindly to be there, to have something to do with the Senate policy; and if I had anything to do with the Senate policy I would say we should change our free trade policy immediately. We should put a tariff on a flexible basis, flexible import fee, and turn it back to the tariff commission and do it on a basis of fair and reasonable competition so that your own workingmen and investors go out and put their money in a business and know it's going to exist, and that they don't have to raise the wages every other day because we're printing new money all the time.

I'd quit printing this counterfeit money and go back on the gold standard. That's what I would do.

Now every move made from here on in, if I have anything to do with it, will be based on the security and the safety of the United States of America. (*Applause*) And that would mean the Monroe Doctrine, Mr. President, as Washington had in mind, when he said no permanent foreign commitments. He didn't say *temporary* foreign

commitments, but he said no *permanent* foreign commitments and that's what the Monroe Doctrine means—to cover the area that's necessary for us to defend currently for our own ultimate safety—and get on a basis so our people can exist for twenty-five or thirty or fifty years. You're in that kind of a war. If you're going to carry it through, you can't exist five years more the way you're going now in the taxes, so I would simply say to you, "Let's go back on a principle of being for the United States of America, you and I, just like Mr. Churchill is for England." And then be for England just like Mr. Churchill is for America, and when you get enough of us in that frame of mind, you'll make a deal and they'll go to work over there and carry their weight. (*Applause*)

*Mr. Smith:* Dr. Hitchcock, I'm very much interested in the emphasis that Senator Malone has given to the Monroe Doctrine. You will remember when that was enunciated in 1823 President Monroe suggested that any foreign attack on any independent republic in the Western Hemisphere, all over the Western Hemisphere, would be construed as an unfriendly act to the United States. And in 1823, we extended our interest, we extended our protection by unilateral action to half of the world. That was not the doctrine of an isolationist. (*Applause*)

I think we can very well go right back to the spirit of President Monroe and suggest that where the institutions of free men are threatened, that threat is a threat to us. And that's true in the Western Hemisphere, it's true in Europe, it's true in East Asia. I'm in entire ac-

cord with the Senator. Let's go back to the Monroe Doctrine.

*Senator Malone:* Let's just have one word on that. I do not put in for one moment with the idea you're protecting every nation in the world with the Monroe Doctrine. I said the Monroe Doctrine could cover the areas that it's necessary for us to currently defend for our own ultimate safety, and those areas change when the weapons of offense and defense change but we then are the judge when we go to war. Right now, we are not the judge. We have signed the Atlantic Pact to go to war when other nations go to war. That is, England and France and Belgium and the Netherlands are empire-minded nations. How are they going to get in war? You know how—by trying to protect their colonial system which is already deader than Julius Caesar. (*Applause*) And we are bound to protect the colonial system, the slavery system, and we were the first ones to break away from it. I do not put in with that for one moment.

*Man:* Mr. Smith, in your opening remarks you indicated quite emphatically that you felt that we were finally on the right track with respect to Nationalist China. What do you feel would be the disadvantage or peril to us to encourage Nationalist China's active military participation in Korea?

*Mr. Smith:* The peril of China's participation, Nationalist China's participation, in Korea. You remember a force of thirty thousand was offered, and on the advice of General MacArthur, that force was turned down. The difficulty is twofold.

First, the military difficulty. It

was not possible at that time and is not possible yet to integrate a Chinese expeditionary force into the forces that we now have in Korea.

The second was the diplomatic difficulty involved in the fact that some of our associates in the United Nations, in the Korean action, have actually recognized the Peking regime, and in so doing have in effect derecognized the Nationalist regime. The military handicap on the one hand, the diplomatic handicap on the other caused General MacArthur to give the advice that it was considerably better at that stage to keep the Nationalist troops in Formosa for defensive purposes only.

*Lady:* Senator Malone, how can you explain democratic inconsistencies in our foreign policy, such as those in our relations with Spain and Yugoslavia?

*Senator Malone:* Miss, I would say to you that I do not attempt to explain them. I condemn them. In other words, you are helping Yugoslavia. You are helping a man who will turn on you just as soon as he is able to do it and get away with it. In other words, he is not our friend—he is a Communist. This is another case when we found agrarian communists in China, you remember, when Mr. Marshall went over there. They've turned out to be worse than the real kind in Russia.

*Mr. Hitchcock:* Mr. Smith, maybe you'd like to attempt to explain these inconsistencies.

*Mr. Smith:* There's a problem of what you do in the case of a friendly relationship with Spain and Yugoslavia which is compli-

cated by the fact that we are unfriendly toward their ideology, toward their form of government. However, Yugoslavia's defection from the communist block helped us considerably. It helped in two ways. First, it was a terrific blow to the morale of the Communists. Second, the defection helped us to save Greece. Now for my part, I think being at least neutral in respect to Tito is not too high a price to pay for the salvation of eight million good Greeks who are on our side.

*Mr. Hitchcock:* Thank you. We have only a few minutes for questions, and I'd like to take one from the young man up front.

*Man:* I'm a member of the College Town Hall Club which has met here since 1939. My question is to Mr. Smith. Should the main purpose of our foreign policy be to defeat the communists or to establish a peaceful world?

*Mr. Smith:* That is not an alternative. There is no such thing as defeat the communists *or* establish a peaceful world. It is only defeat the communists *and* establish a peaceful world. (*Applause*) Let me repeat, we have no choice. This contest is not of our making; we did not begin it. In the name of peace and a free world, we will have to finish it.

*Man:* Senator Malone, if financial aid by the United States to foreign countries should be diminished or stopped, how would this affect the present amicable relationship between America and the foreign countries?

*Senator Malone:* Well, I think they might sue us for nonsupport. They won't be any madder at us



than they are now. They hate us the way it is, so as long as we support them, they will take it on suffrance.

*Man:* Robert Smith, in choosing between Taft and Eisenhower, who do you believe would have the most realistic outlook on foreign policy?

*Mr. Smith:* I'll tell you right now, I'm going to vote for Dwight D. Eisenhower if I possibly get a chance. That's my answer. (*Applause*)

*Senator Malone:* I'm going to allow my delegates from Nevada to make up my mind who we'll be for, and then I'm going home and support whoever we nominate. We must get rid of this outfit in Washington. (*Applause*)

*Lady:* My question is directed to Senator Malone. In regard to the United Nations, shouldn't the United States show more fair-minded tendencies toward the other nations, rather than striving to dominate the policy decisions?

*Senator Malone:* I have never known them to win a peace conference in the whole world. The United States is being dominated at this moment by the United Nations, and the United Nations, if we would use it for what it really was supposed to be used for—I was at San Francisco representing a Senate Military Force Committee, was not in the Senate, was their consultant—never was supposed to run an army. It can't run an army.

*Mr. Hitchcock:* Thank you, Senator Malone and Robert A. Smith, for this very interesting and helpful discussion. On behalf of Town Hall, I wish to thank our Milwaukee host, Dr. J. Martin Klotsche, president of Wisconsin State College, and Dr. A. A. Suppan, Director of its summer session and extension division. Also our appreciation to WCAN, ABC in Milwaukee. So plan to be with us next week and every week at the sound of the Crier's Bell.



## KEEP UP WITH CAMPAIGN ISSUES THE "TOWN MEETING" WAY

For your reference, here is a list of "Town Meeting" bulletins issued during past months whose texts will further *your* understanding of the '52 elections battleground. They may be ordered by number at 15c each by writing to the Bulletin Office, Town Hall, Inc., New York 36, N. Y.

- | Number   | Volume 17 |
|--|-----------|
| 27 "WHO CAN WIN IN 1952?"—Rep. Hugh D. Scott, Jr., Sen. Owen Brewster, Jonathan Daniels.<br>October 30, 1951.        |           |
| 37 "HOW CAN WE FIGHT CORRUPTION IN GOVERNMENT?"—Senator Paul H. Douglas, Sen. Alexander Wiley.<br>January 8, 1952.   |           |
| 39 "THE REPUBLICAN NOMINATION—EISENHOWER OR TAFT?"—Sen. Owen Brewster, Rep. Christian A. Herter.<br>January 22, 1952 |           |
| 45 "WHAT SHOULD BE OUR PROGRAM TOWARD ASIA?"—Norman Thomas, John C. Caldwell.<br>March 4, 1952.                      |           |
| 48 "IS GOVERNMENT STIFLING FREE ENTERPRISE?"—Sen. Homer Capehart, Sen. John J. Sparkman.<br>March 25, 1952           |           |
| 51 "DO WE WANT A MILITARY MAN IN THE WHITE HOUSE?"—Pauline Frederick, Kenneth Crawford.<br>April 15, 1952            |           |

### Volume 18

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1 "WHAT ROLE FOR THE SOUTH IN THE COMING ELECTION?"—Grover C. Hall, Jr., Doris Fleeson.<br>May 6, 1952                                    |  |
| 2 "REPUBLICANS OR DEMOCRATS—WHICH WILL GIVE US A BETTER FOREIGN POLICY?"—Sen. Robert Kerr, Sen. Owen Brewster.<br>May 13, 1952.           |  |
| 6 "SHOULD OUR FOREIGN POLICY BE CHANGED?"—Sen. George W. Malone, Robert Aura Smith.<br>June 10, 1952 (current issue)                      |  |
| 7 "HOW WILL A CHANGE OF ADMINISTRATION AFFECT OUR WORLD POSITION?"—Hodding Carter, John Temple Graves II.<br>June 17, 1952 (to be issued) |  |

---

Order single copies at 15c each from TOWN HALL, Inc.  
Town Hall, New York 36, N. Y.

---

Twenty-six Consecutive Issues of Town Meeting Bulletin Will Be Sent at This Special Low Subscription Rate:.....	}	26 Weeks for Only <b>\$3.00</b> Single Copies 15c
---	---	---